



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,324	02/26/2002	Anatoliy Panasyuk	2006579-0420 (CTX-079)	4049
69665 7590 08/28/2008 CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110				
EXAMINER				
HENNING, MATTHEW T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2131				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/083,324

Applicant(s)

PANASYUK ET AL.

Examiner

MATTHEW T. HENNING

Art Unit

2131

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 and 68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 and 68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/25/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

This action is in response to the communication filed on 7/25/2008.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/25/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/25/2008 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection presented below.

Claims 1-66, and 68 have been examined.

All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64, 66, and 68 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezak et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0018913) hereinafter referred to as Brezak, further in view of Ganesan (US Patent Number

5,557,678), and further in view of Brezak et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0150253) hereinafter referred to as Brezak2.

Regarding claim 1, Brezak disclosed a method of authenticating a client to a content server (See Brezak Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising the steps of: generating, by a ticket authority (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206), a first ticket (TGT or service ticket A) and a second ticket (Service Ticket for target server C) wherein said second ticket is disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); transmitting, by said ticket authority, said first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraph 0042-0043); validating, by said ticket authority, said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045-0048); using, by said client, said first ticket to establish a communication session with a content server proxy after said first ticket is validated (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043-0045); enabling, by said ticket authority, said second ticket for use upon said validation of said first ticket, said enabled second ticket can be validated by said ticket authority (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048); and using, by said content server proxy, said enabled second ticket to establish a communication session with said content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048), but failed to disclose generating the disabled second ticket before the first ticket was validated, or that the disabled second ticket cannot be validated by the ticket authority until enabled by said ticket authority.

However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention that, in order to avoid processor overloading, instead of generating data upon request, the data can be pre-generated and stored for use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8 Final paragraph).

Brezak2 teaches that upon receipt of a request for a service ticket, once the request has been validated, the ticket issuer sets the service ticket's flags and certain fields of the service

1 ticket are filled in using information from the request, as well as through generation at the time
2 of filling, such as the validity period start/end times, and a new random session key (See Brezak2
3 Paragraphs 0059-0063). Brezak2 further teaches that once the ticket's fields are full, the ticket is
4 encrypted and transmitted to the requestor (See Brezak2 Paragraph 0063).

5 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to have employed
6 what was common in the art in the ticketing system of Brezak by having the TTP pre-generate
7 and store at least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for these tickets. This would
8 have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to
9 have avoid processor overloading in the event of a large number of simultaneous requests.

10 It further would have been obvious to the person skilled in the art to have employed the
11 teachings of Brezak2 in the system of Brezak by filling in the appropriate fields in the service
12 ticket, including the validity period start/end times, upon validation of the ticket request from
13 Server A. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would
14 have been motivated to ensure that the ticket contained the proper data for the requester, and that
15 the data was fresh.

16 Regarding claim 23, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
17 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority (See
18 Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206); a content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 214); and a content
19 server proxy (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) in communication with said client, said ticket
20 authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2), wherein said ticket authority generates a
21 first ticket (TGT) and a second ticket (Service Ticket), wherein said first ticket is transmitted to
22 said client and used to establish a first communication session with said content server proxy

(See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045), and wherein said second ticket is transmitted to said content server proxy and used to establish a second communication session with said content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045), but failed to disclose generating the disabled second ticket before the first ticket was validated, or that the disabled second ticket cannot be validated by the ticket authority until enabled by said ticket authority.

However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention that, in order to avoid processor overloading, instead of generating data upon request, the data can be pre-generated and stored for use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8 Final paragraph).

Brezak2 teaches that upon receipt of a request for a service ticket, once the request has been validated, the ticket issuer sets the service ticket's flags and certain fields of the service ticket are filled in using information from the request, as well as through generation at the time of filling, such as the validity period start/end times, and a new random session key (See Brezak2 Paragraphs 0059-0063). Brezak2 further teaches that once the ticket's fields are full, the ticket is encrypted and transmitted to the requestor (See Brezak2 Paragraph 0063).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to have employed what was common in the art in the ticketing system of Brezak by having the TTP pre-generate and store at least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for these tickets. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to have avoid processor overloading in the event of a large number of simultancous requests.

It further would have been obvious to the person skilled in the art to have employed the teachings of Brezak2 in the system of Brezak by filling in the appropriate fields in the service ticket, including the validity period start/end times, upon validation of the ticket request from

1 Server A. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would
2 have been motivated to ensure that the ticket contained the proper data for the requester, and that
3 the data was fresh.

4 Regarding claim 45, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
5 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority
6 generating a first ticket (TGT) and a second ticket (Service Ticket) wherein said second ticket is
7 disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); a content server (See Brezak
8 Fig. 2 Element 214); a content server proxy in communication with said client, said ticket
9 authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) and receiving said first ticket
10 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0044); and a web server in communication with said client and
11 said ticket authority (See Brezak Fig. 1 Element 178 and Paragraphs 0031-0032), wherein said
12 content server proxy establishes a first communication session between said client and said
13 content server proxy after said ticket authority validates said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs
14 0043-0045), wherein said ticket authority enables said second ticket after said validation of said
15 first ticket, said enabled second ticket can be validated by said ticket authority (See Brezak
16 Paragraphs 0045-0048), and wherein said content server proxy uses said enabled second ticket to
17 establish a second communication session with a protocol different from said first
18 communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraph 0045), but failed to disclose generating
19 the disabled second ticket before the first ticket was validated, or that the disabled second ticket
20 cannot be validated by the ticket authority until enabled by said ticket authority.

1 However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention that, in order to avoid
2 processor overloading, instead of generating data upon request, the data can be pre-generated and
3 stored for use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8 Final paragraph).

4 Brezak2 teaches that upon receipt of a request for a service ticket, once the request has
5 been validated, the ticket issuer sets the service ticket's flags and certain fields of the service
6 ticket are filled in using information from the request, as well as through generation at the time
7 of filling, such as the validity period start/end times, and a new random session key (See Brezak2
8 Paragraphs 0059-0063). Brezak2 further teaches that once the ticket's fields are full, the ticket is
9 encrypted and transmitted to the requestor (See Brezak2 Paragraph 0063).

10 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to have employed
11 what was common in the art in the ticketing system of Brezak by having the TTP pre-generate
12 and store at least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for these tickets. This would
13 have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to
14 have avoid processor overloading in the event of a large number of simultaneous requests.

15 It further would have been obvious to the person skilled in the art to have employed the
16 teachings of Brezak2 in the system of Brezak by filling in the appropriate fields in the service
17 ticket, including the validity period start/end times, upon validation of the ticket request from
18 Server A. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would
19 have been motivated to ensure that the ticket contained the proper data for the requester, and that
20 the data was fresh.

21 Regarding claim 68, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
22 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising; means for generating, by a ticket authority, a first ticket (TGT)

1 and a second ticket (Service Ticket) (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); means for
2 transmitting, by said ticket authority, said first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-
3 0043); means for using, by said client, said first ticket to establish a first communication session
4 with a content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045); means for transmitting, by
5 said ticket authority, said second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043
6 and 0045-0048); and means for using, by said content server proxy, said second ticket to
7 establish a second communication session with a content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-
8 0048), but failed to disclose generating the disabled second ticket before the first ticket was
9 validated, or that the disabled second ticket cannot be validated by the ticket authority until
10 enabled by said ticket authority.

11 However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention that, in order to avoid
12 processor overloading, instead of generating data upon request, the data can be pre-generated and
13 stored for use when requested (See Ganesan Col. 8 Final paragraph).

14 Brezak2 teaches that upon receipt of a request for a service ticket, once the request has
15 been validated, the ticket issuer sets the service ticket's flags and certain fields of the service
16 ticket are filled in using information from the request, as well as through generation at the time
17 of filling, such as the validity period start/end times, and a new random session key (See Brezak2
18 Paragraphs 0059-0063). Brezak2 further teaches that once the ticket's fields are full, the ticket is
19 encrypted and transmitted to the requestor (See Brezak2 Paragraph 0063).

20 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to have employed
21 what was common in the art in the ticketing system of Brezak by having the TTP pre-generate
22 and store at least the service tickets prior to receiving a request for these tickets. This would

1 have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to
2 have avoid processor overloading in the event of a large number of simultaneous requests.

3 It further would have been obvious to the person skilled in the art to have employed the
4 teachings of Brezak2 in the system of Brezak by filling in the appropriate fields in the service
5 ticket, including the validity period start/end times, upon validation of the ticket request from
6 Server A. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would
7 have been motivated to ensure that the ticket contained the proper data for the requester, and that
8 the data was fresh.

9 Regarding claims 2, 24, and 46, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that
10 prior to generating said ticket associated with said client, said client is authenticated with a web
11 server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043).

12 Regarding claims 3, 25, and 47-48, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that
13 said ticket authority transmits said first ticket to a web server and said web server transmits said
14 first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032).

15 Regarding claims 4, 26, and 49, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that said client
16 transmits said first ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0043 and 0044).

17 Regarding claims 5, 27, and 50-51, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that said
18 content server proxy transmits said first ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority
19 transmits said second ticket to said content server proxy upon validation of said first ticket (See
20 Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048).

Art Unit: 2131

1 Regarding claims 6, 10, 28,32, 52 and 56, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that
2 said content server proxy transmits said second ticket to said content server upon said enabling
3 of said second ticket (See Brezak Paragraph 0036 and 0045).

4 Regarding claims 11, 33-34, and 57-58, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that
5 said ticket authority transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to a web server and
6 said web server transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said client (See
7 Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032 and 0042-0043).

Regarding claims 12, 35, and 59, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that said client transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0044; The data copied from the request reads on the disabled second ticket).

Regarding claim 13, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed transmitting said disabled second ticket to at least one of said content server proxy and a web server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043; The data copied from the request reads on the disabled second ticket).

Regarding claims 36, and 60, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that said content server proxy transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority enables said disabled second ticket (See Brezak Paragraph 0045; The data copied from the request reads on the disabled second ticket).

Regarding claims 14, 37, and 61, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed transmitting said enabled second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0048).

Regarding claims 15, 38, and 62, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that a communication session protocol is established between said client and said content server (See Brezak Paragraph 0036).

Regarding claims 16-17, 39-40, and 63-64, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that a first communication session protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second communication session protocol is established between said content server proxy and said content server, wherein said first communication session protocol is different from said second communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0036 and 0043), said

1 client communicating with said content server via said first communication session and said
2 second communication session (See Brezak Paragraphs 0041, 0043, 0044, and Fig. 2).

3 Regarding claims 18-19, and 41-42, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that a first
4 communication session protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy
5 and a second communication session protocol is established between said client and a web
6 server, wherein said first communication session protocol is different from said second
7 communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032 and 0043).

8 Regarding claims 21, 44, and 66, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed that said
9 content server proxy is a secure socket layer relay (See Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049, and
10 0053).

11
12 Regarding claims 20, 22, 43, and 65, Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed a client
13 system including many features such as accessing web sites (See Brezak Paragraphs 0005 and
14 0016-0033), and transmitting a second ticket to a proxy server for the use of a specifically
15 identified server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049), but failed to disclose that the client
16 comprised a web browser or that the server was identified by its address.

17 However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention that computers used web
18 browsers for accessing web sites. It was further well know in the art at the time of invention that
19 servers were identified by their addresses. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary
20 person skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide the client with a web browser and to
21 identify the target server by its address. This would have been obvious because the ordinary

1 person skilled in the art would have been motivated to apply what was well known and common
2 in the art at the time.

3 Claims 7-9, 29-31, and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
4 over Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 as applied to claims 1, 23, and 45 above, and further in view
5 of Litai et al. (US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0233554) hereinafter referred to
6 as Litai.

7 Brezak, Ganesan, and Brezak2 disclosed accessing a target server through a proxy server
8 using a service ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048) but failed to disclose the specific
9 method used for the target server to verify the service ticket.

10 Litai teaches that in a ticketing system, in order for a server to verify a service ticket, the
11 server sends the ticket to the ticket server (See Litai Paragraph 0046).

12 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
13 invention to employ the teachings of Litai in the ticketing system of Brezak, Ganesan, and
14 Brezak2 by having the target server send the service ticket to the trusted third party in order to
15 have the ticket verified. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in
16 the art would have been motivated to protect the server from unauthorized access.

17
18 ***Conclusion***

19 Claims 1-66, and 68 have been rejected.

20 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
21 examiner should be directed to MATTHEW T. HENNING whose telephone number is
22 (571)272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

1 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
2 supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the
3 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

4 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
5 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
6 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
7 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
8 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
9 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would
10 like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated
11 information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

12
13 /Matthew T Henning/
14 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2131